

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-2 and 4-9 are pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Claim 3 has been canceled. No new claims have been added.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by **Obradovich** (previously applied).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted in Applicants' response of May 25, 2005, **Obradovich** discloses a location tagged data provision and display system. A personal communication device (PCD) with electromagnetic communication capability has a GPS receiver and a display. The PCD requests maps and location tagged data from data providers and other for display on the PCD. The data providers respond to requests by using searching and sorting schemes to interrogate data bases and then automatically transmit data responsive to the requests to the requesting PCD.

The Examiner has urged that column 23, lines 37-44 of **Obradovich** disclose converting image data obtained from photography by the image pickup device to a radio signal and transmitting the radio signal to the communication terminal device having the inputted identifying information via a switching office of the telephone line network, when the transmitting key is manipulated.

However, column 23, lines 37-44 disclose:

The image taken using the PCD camera, along with the appropriate GPS stamp, is provided by the cellular communication capability, included with the device, to a central computer storage system. The central computer storage system then makes the CRD device data available, in the manner as previously described, to those requesting condition reporting device data.

According to the PCD of Obradovich, the GPS stamp and image are only provided to the central computer storage system, and the GPS stamp and image are not transmitted to a communication terminal device having inputted identifying information. Accordingly, a user carrying the PCD cannot notify a party whom the user is scheduled to meet of the present location of the user. The party needs to request data from the central computer storage system to ascertain the present location of the user.

The Examiner has stated that Applicants' argument that the information (image) is sent to a party to allow the individual to determine the sender's locale is not included in the claim language.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 5 have been amended to recite that a person viewing the communication terminal device (not the central computer storage system of Obradovich) may determine a location of a user (sender) of the portable communication device.

Furthermore, the Examiner has also urged that FIG. 11, column 11, lines 53-57 and column 12, lines 1-19 disclose that two displays are included which show the detected location information on one display and a photographed image taken by a digital camera on the other display.

Applicants respectfully disagree. FIG. 11 shows two displays of a GPS street map, but does not show a photographed image taken by an image pickup device on either one of the displays, as recited in claim 6 of the instant application.

In particular, the two displays 272, 273 in Obradovich show a user's location on a GPS map on one display and a third party's map and location on the other display, and therefore, fail

to disclose location information on one display and a photographed image on the other display, as recited in claim 6 of the instant application.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-2 and 4-9, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,  
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

  
William L. Brooks

Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/ak  
Atty. Docket No. 011728  
Suite 1000  
1725 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time and required fee